

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This case has been reviewed and analyzed in view of the Official Action dated 16 January 2004. Responsive to the rejections made by the Examiner in the Official Action, Claim 1 has been amended and Claim 2 has been inserted to more clearly clarify the inventive concept of the Applicant.

Prior to a discussion of the Examiner's objections and rejections, it is believed that it may be beneficial to briefly review the subject Patent Application system in light of the inventive concept of the Applicant. The subject Patent Application system is directed to a light bulb having a convex lens formed therein. As shown in Figure 1, the bulb includes a glass shell 1 housing a pair of conductive wires 2 with a tungsten filament 3 connecting the conductive wire 2. The glass shell 1 has an upper region 11 forming a convex lens. As shown in Figure 2 of the Drawings, in one only embodiment, the convex lens 11 has an upper surface which is substantially planar and a lower surface which is convex. In the embodiment of Figure 3, the upper surface of the lens 11 is convex and the lower surface is concave.

The Examiner has rejected Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (b) as being anticipated by the Williams Patent 5,508,587. It is the Examiner's best contention that all elements of independent Claim 1, as originally filed, are taught by the Williams reference.

The Williams reference is directed towards an incandescent lamp for use with an optical fiber. As shown in Figure 2 of the Drawings, the lamp 10 includes a glass shell 16 housing a pair of wires 13 and 14, with a filament 20 connecting the wires. The shell 16 has a top region 30 forming some type of lens structure with opposing convex type surfaces with one of the surfaces having an undulating contour to provide some type of light translating path which may be advantageous to the particular shaped filaments 20 or 120 of the Williams system. The particular shapes of the Williams reference elements 20 and 120 may be the reason why the particular undulating contours for the lens is used. It is respectfully submitted that the entire concept of the subject invention is directed to a light transmission system and thus the contouring of the lens is of great importance to the operability of the system.

It is noted that in the Williams system, the lens 30 has an upper surface and a lower surface, with the upper surface being convex and the lower surface having an undulating shape. In contradistinction, in the embodiment shown in Figure 2 of the subject Patent Application system Drawings, the convex lens 11 formed in the upper region of the shell 1 has a substantially planar upper surface and a purely convex lower surface. Further, in the embodiment of Figure 3, the upper surface of lens 11 is convex and the lower surface is concave.

In the embodiments of both Figures 2 and 3, the convex lens 11 formed in the upper region of shell 1 will form a unique focusing or condensing lens. In the Williams system, the undulating lower surface of lens 30, shown in Figure 2, will create a rather unusual or atypical optical pattern, with the undulating surface giving a distortion to the light beam somewhat separate from a standard focusing lens.

Thus, the Williams reference does not provide for: "... said convex lens having an upper surface and a lower surface, said upper surface being substantially planar, said lower surface being convex ...", as is clearly provided by newly-amended independent Claim 1. Further, the Williams reference does not provide for: "... said convex lens having an upper surface and a lower surface, said upper surface being convex, said lower surface being concave ...", as is clearly provided by newly-inserted independent Claim 2.

Thus, based upon independent Claims 1 and 2, it is not believed that the subject Application is anticipated by, or made obvious by, the Williams reference when independent Claims 1 and 2 are carefully reviewed.

The remaining references cited by the Examiner but not used in the rejection have been reviewed, but are believed to be further removed when patentable distinctions are taken into account than those cited by the Examiner in the rejection.

MR1197-500
Serial Number: 09/988,430
Reply to Office Action dated 16 January 2004

It is now believed that the subject Patent Application has been placed in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Morton J. Rosenberg".

Morton J. Rosenberg
Registration #26,049

Dated: 4/9/04

Suite 101
3458 Ellicott Center Drive
Ellicott City, MD 21043
(410) 465-6678